

## **SEAPORT-E RATINGS GUIDE**

### **DATED 24 JANUARY 2012**

#### **TECHNICAL EVALUATION**

In evaluating the proposals, the Technical Evaluation Board (TEB) will assign combined technical/risk adjectival ratings (Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Marginal, and Unacceptable) to the technical evaluation factors and subfactors identified in Section M of the Solicitation. A proposal need not have all of the characteristics of an adjectival rating description in order to receive that adjectival rating. Evaluators will use subjective judgment to rate proposals most appropriately using these characteristics as guidelines.

Subsequent to and consistent with the narrative evaluation, which shall identify a proposal's strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and risks, the appropriate combined technical/risk adjectival rating shall be assigned to each factor and significant subfactor, if required.

Following are the narrative descriptions for the combined technical/risk adjectival ratings:

#### **OUTSTANDING**

- Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements.
- Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses.
- Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.

#### **GOOD**

- Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements.
- Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses.
- Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.

#### **ACCEPTABLE**

- Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
- Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance.
- Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.

#### **MARGINAL**

- Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
- Proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths.
- Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.

#### **UNACCEPTABLE**

- Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies.
- Proposal is unawardable.

## **PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

The past performance evaluation results in an assessment of the offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements. The past performance evaluation considers each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the contract's requirements. One performance confidence assessment rating is assigned for each offeror after evaluating the offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the contract requirements.

There are two aspects to the past performance evaluation. The first is to evaluate the offeror's past performance to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection. The second is to determine how well the contractor performed on the contracts.

## **PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATING**

The criteria to establish what is recent and relevant shall be unique to each source selection and shall be stated in the solicitation. In establishing what is relevant for the acquisition, consideration should be given to those aspects of an offeror's contract history that would give the greatest ability to measure whether the offeror will satisfy the current procurement. Common aspects of relevancy include similarity of service/support, complexity; dollar value, contract type, and degree of subcontract/teaming.

There are four levels of relevancy (Very Relevant, Relevant, Somewhat Relevant, and Not Relevant). More relevant past performance will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and have more influence on the past performance confidence assessment than past performance of lesser relevance.

Following are the narrative descriptions for the past performance relevancy levels:

**VERY RELEVANT** - Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

**RELEVANT** - Present/past performance effort involved much of the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

**SOMEWHAT RELEVANT** - Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

**NOT RELEVANT** - Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

## **PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

The second aspect of the past performance evaluation is to determine how well the contractor performed on the contracts. The past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the offeror performed those past contracts. This evaluation does not establish, create, or change the existing record and history of the offeror's past performance on past contracts. Requirements for considering history of small business utilization are outlined at FAR 15.304(c) (3) (ii) and DFARS 215.305(a) (2).

Sources of past performance information for evaluation include the following:

- Past performance information may be provided by the offeror, as solicited.
- Past performance information may be obtained from questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of the acquisition.
- Past performance information shall be obtained from any other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officers, and Fee Determining Officials; and the Defense Contract Management Agency.

The evaluation team will review past performance information and determine the quality and usefulness as it applies to the performance confidence assessment.

## **PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT**

In conducting a performance confidence assessment, each offeror shall be assigned one of the following ratings:

**SUBSTANTIAL CONFIDENCE** - Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE** - Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**LIMITED CONFIDENCE** - Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**NO CONFIDENCE** - Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

**UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE (NEUTRAL)** - No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. See FAR 15.305(2).

## **DEFINITIONS**

**DEFICIENCY** - is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. See FAR 15.001.

**PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT** - is an evaluation of the likelihood (or Government's confidence) that the offeror will successfully perform the solicitation's requirements; the evaluation is based upon past performance information.

**RECENCY** - as it pertains to past performance information, is a measure of the time that has elapsed since the past performance reference occurred. Recency is generally expressed as a time period during which past performance references are considered relevant.

**RELEVANCY** - as it pertains to past performance information, is a measure of the extent of similarity between the service/support effort, complexity, dollar value, contract type, and subcontract/teaming or other comparable attributes of past performance examples and the source solicitation requirements; and a measure of the likelihood that the past performance is an indicator of future performance.

**RISK** - as it pertains to source selection, is the potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses the degree to which an offeror's proposed approach to achieving the technical factor or subfactor may involve risk of disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

**SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESS** - in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

**STRENGTH** - is an aspect of an offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

**WEAKNESS** - means a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.